

**WHOIS Hypotheses Study Group
Teleconference
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 8 July 2008 15:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the WHOIS Hypotheses Study Group teleconference on 8 July, at 15:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

At: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-whois-study-group-20080708.mp3>

On page:

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#jul>

Meeting notes:

<http://forum.icann.org/lists/gnso-whois-study/msg00077.html>

List of studies with original hypotheses <http://forum.icann.org/lists/gnso-whois-study/msg00078.html>

Participants present:

Chuck Gomes - GNSO Council vice chair -gTLD Registry C

David Maher - gTLD Registry C

Steve Metalitz - IPC

Lee Eulgen -IPC

Steve DelBianco - CBUC

Tony Harris - ISP

Tim Ruiz - Registrar

James Bladel - Registrar

Olga Cavalli - NomCom appointee to Council

Wendy Seltzer - ALAC Liaison on the ICANN Board

Alan Greenberg - ALAC Liaison on the GNSO Council

ICANN Staff:

Liz Gasster

Patrick Jones

Glen de Saint Géry

Man: Hello? Am I back on?

Woman: Yes, yes, you're back on.

Man: Okay, I - (unintelligible).

Woman: But the Operator hasn't said anything.

(Chuck): Yeah, nor have I heard anything.

Man: Well, I heard a (unintelligible).

(Chuck): Yeah, I did, too, and I wondered if - has the recording started?

Coordinator: Hello, sorry, this is the Operator.

Woman: Has the recording started?

Coordinator: Yes, madam.

(Chuck): Oh, thank you. Thank you very much.

Woman: Okay.

(Chuck): Okay, so everybody's aware that this is being recorded and that the MP3 will be distributed. So if you don't like that your option is to get off the call which isn't very many options but just want everybody to be aware.

Glen Right. I got you the list Olga Cavalli nominating committee, (Steve Delbianco), (BC, Chuck Gomes) is the leader of the group, (David Maher), registry constituency Allen Greenberg is the ALAC Liaison, (Tony Harris), ISP, (Wendy Seltzer , ALAC Liaison to the Board.

(Liz Gasster), Staff, (Patrick Jones), Staff, (Lee Eulgen), (IPC), (Steve Metalitz), (IPC), (Steve Delbianco) - sorry, (Steve), I've mentioned you twice. (James Bladel), Registrar and (Tim Ruiz), Registrar.

(Chuck): Thank you, everyone for joining the call. Is there anyone whose name was not called? Okay, any concerns about the agenda that was distributed? Okay, then let's move on.

Our tasks and Item 4 on the agenda and hopefully everybody has the agenda in front of you, it's on the Wiki and I think was distributed otherwise as well, I'm not going to read the tasks. I think all of you can read unless somebody really wants me to.

It's really a pretty narrow task and I did mention on that agenda one key reference document that's the Summary of Public Suggestions. So that is something that you may want to reference when we're doing this.

And so certainly you might find that useful to have that available. And let me get back to where - my right screen here as I flipped around here. And clicking to that document. There we go. Okay.

Liz Gasster: So, (Chuck), it's (Liz) and I was just going to offer it when you get down to the hypotheses if you want me to edit for you I'm happy to edit (unintelligible).

(Chuck): I probably will. Well, thanks and what you may want - do it whatever way is easiest for you. If you're more comfortable doing it in the Wiki, that's okay.

Liz Gasster: Yeah, I'm going to try to just do it in the Wiki as we talk. And if I can't get something done - I'll go into Edit Mode now and -

(Chuck): Okay.

Liz Gasster: - for anyone else who might be editing.

(Chuck): Thanks, (Liz).

Liz Gasster: Yeah.

(Chuck): Appreciate that. Okay, so our deliverable's gonna be a report listing the hypotheses for the WHOIS study recommendations and those came from the public comments and the (gack) input and so forth.

Some cases it's probably going to be relatively easy to state those hypotheses because the missions were pretty clear on the hypotheses. In other cases it's a little more challenging and we're going to work together to try and formulate wording of the hypotheses that we think accurately reflects the proposed study.

So I did take a first crack - I actually did this in Paris at the - and I did a little bit of editing since then, but - before I distributed them to this group just to help get us started.

We can totally throw mine out the window and start over when we come to them and that's perfectly okay.

My suggested approach on this is that we examine each suggestive study one at a time and then try and formulate a one sentence - brief

sentence hypotheses worded in such a way that it could be tested and either confirmed or refuted or whatever.

We'll start - just for simplicity and to help get us started we'll use my draft list of hypotheses and see if we want to change those, throw them out and start over or whatever for each one. We'll take one at a time. And my intent is to try and reach maximum consensus on the wording of each one.

If we need to in some cases I may get a couple volunteers to go back and work on the wording of some and come back in - before our next meeting. We'll see whether we need to do that as we go. But that's certainly an option so that we can maximize our efficiency.

Any problems with that approach?

(Allen Greenberg): I - (unintelligible), I have a question. The resolution said once we come back with (unintelligible) the council will then decide which, if any, warrant further - warrant actual studies.

That sounds like a work with yet another working group but ignoring that should we be making any attempt to merge them together where clearly several hypotheses or several or the submitted studies really could be the same study with, you know, multiple - with more variations?

(Chuck): Yeah, I think that would be wise to do. In fact, if you look at what I did there's some cases where I kind of did that. I saw that they were kind of the same. Whether I did it right or not we can decide.

But, yeah, I think that as long as - I think what we need to do, and (Liz) will help us in this regard, is to make sure that we just tie in the references to the proposed studies so that people can make the connection.

(Allen Greenburg): Okay, because I think we need to minimize the work that has to be done and if we're going through the complete list one by one we should try to get any reasonable things done that we can at the same time.

(Chuck): Exactly, that's - good point, (Allen).

Steve Metalitz: (Chuck), this is Steve Metalitz.

(Chuck): Go ahead, (Steve).

Steve Metalitz: I have a question, also. So one document you didn't include was the 22nd of May report of the previous WHOIS study group. Is that document totally inoperative or totally irrelevant to our work here?

(Chuck): No, it is not inoperative. It's still - what I tried to do is keep it real simple to facilitate our tasks. To the extent that it's useful to go back to that one, that's perfectly legitimate and I encourage it, yeah.

And that may be the case in some cases the - for simplicity of reference I used the - I started to link that one, too, (Steve), and then I said, "Well, let's see, am I going to confuse people. I particularly want them to tie in the study numbers and so forth on that one document that came out of the other documents." So - but that's fine.

Steve Metalitz: Okay, thank you.

(Steve Delbianco): And, (Chuck), it's (Steve Delbianco) one clarifying question. The workers that worked on the May group that Steve Metalitz just mentioned, we took on an additional path which was to prioritize the studies, not just to list which ones to do but to prioritize them.

There's nothing in your current proposed agenda that indicates that we should prioritize them.

(Chuck): No.

(Steve Delbianco): And that wasn't part of (unintelligible) resolution.

(Chuck): And that's not...

(Steve Delbianco): That's not necessarily but I'm just asking whether that's inferred or do we do...

(Chuck): No, it is not and in fact the motion did not ask us to do any prioritization. It's really a pretty simple tasks and that is to make sure we have clearly written out the hypotheses that could be tested so that when the council looks at this, okay, they can read a hypotheses and say, "Now, would that give us information that would possibly be useful to us in whatever we decide to do going forward and therefore maybe worth spending some money on to get the hypotheses tested?"

(Steve Delbianco): But it - and that means there would be no inferred priority by the order in which we do them.

(Chuck): That is correct. Okay? And - okay? And let's just briefly talk about meeting the plan right now is to just use this time on Tuesday's for however long we need and we'll probably have a little bit of feel for that after this meeting today.

I don't think it'll take very many meetings and certainly we may be able to do some work in between to speed that up even further. Are there any huge objections to this time on Tuesday's going forward?

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Chuck): Go ahead.

(Steve Delbianco): (Chuck), this is (Steve). I did put a comment on the social text workspace on this item which was your Point 7b, we will meet until we finish. I didn't know whether that meant that each meeting is open ended in time or we'll have as many meetings as we need to finish the job or just what did you mean there?

(Chuck): Yeah, we're going to meet today until we're done. No, we'll keep it to a reasonable time limit. In fact, several people - I don't know if you were on (Steve) when (Wendy) made a comment and I think (Olga) did, too, hour, hour and 15 minutes today may be all we can do today.

And we'll judge that. Hopefully we'll get a good start on a few hypotheses today that'll give us a good feel for how much time it's going to take. And if we need to do it more like an hour and a half meeting or something we'll do that.

(Steve Delbianco): I would just suggest that each meeting have a set ending point because otherwise it's difficult to schedule.

(Chuck): Okay, well, let's - generally I think you can do an hour and a half pretty well and still be productive, an hour's probably a little more idea but does anybody have a problem if we generally think of an hour and a half for these meetings?

Okay, then Glen, let's assume an hour and a half for these meetings and we'll probably cut this one a little bit short because of some people's demands today.

Woman: Thank you, (Chuck).

(Chuck): Okay, thanks, (Steve). All right. If there are no further - oh, and if you miss a meeting please assume the individual responsibility of coming up to speed in terms of what you missed. You'll be able to listen to an MP3 recording. I will try hopefully within 24 hours or less, generally I'll try to do it the same day, to give a quick little summary that I'll distribute of what we accomplished in the meeting and (Liz)'ll help me on that in terms of updating the Wiki so you'll be able to see what we did on the Wiki.

One of the limitations of the Wiki is that it doesn't readily show the changes made in things but (Liz) are you going to use some of the formatting conventions that we've used in other groups like this to show where changes are made?

Liz Gasster: I can, particularly - but I wasn't planning to for this. I was planning to just update as we go. So if you want me to...

(Chuck): I think that's probably okay unless somebody objects. So...

Liz Gasster: The way I think I'd need to do it is to actually, you know, in parens include the name or something of whoever had a point. It's not like (unintelligible). So...

(Chuck): Yeah, okay. All right. Do what works most efficiently there. I think...

Liz Gasster: I can switch to - I mean, the thing to do would be to switch to word processing and, you know, edit (in track) changes if people really needed to see.

(Chuck): Is there a desire for that? It is (unintelligible).

Tim Ruiz: (Chuck), this is (Tim).

(Chuck): Go ahead, (Tim).

Tim Ruiz: Would it be possible to just include, you know, instead of having a track of all the changes just like the previous version and the current version for a comparison or...

Liz Gasster: I just don't know the Wiki well enough. Can I do that and, I mean, will it retain the earlier version? I think it might...

(Chuck): Well, why don't we do this if nobody has any objection because we can always cut and paste into the Wiki, okay? And (Liz), you're gonna have the final say on that but do you have a Word version handy that you could just use the tracking function today?

Liz Gasster: I'm going to go ahead and create one.

(Chuck): I have one if you want me to send it to you.

Liz Gasster: Well - sure, and then meanwhile I'll do this, too and see what (unintelligible).

(Chuck): Okay, hold on a second. I will...

Liz Gasster: Now if someone has some objection to using track changes.

(Chuck): Well, that's fine. We're going to transfer that over into the Wiki as well. So those that don't want to use that don't have to use it. I don't think that's unreasonable. Does anybody think that's...

Liz Gasster: (Unintelligible).

(Chuck): Okay, okay, so let me find that document here. I've got it up online but...

Liz Gasster: Okay, I've actually got it now in Word. So...

(Chuck): You've got it. Okay, so you don't need me to send you anything. Okay.

Liz Gasster: ...I don't need you to send it.

(Chuck): Yeah.

Liz Gasster: It transferred well from the Wiki. So I'm okay.

(Chuck): Okay, good. Then - and I'm actually going to be working off my Word version here as we go. So all right, let's start off right with Area 1, who is misuse studies?

And Study Number 1 I have there, if anybody wants to look at the document - the main reference document, the study submission number 1 was to gather data on who is misuse from Consumer Protection Bureaus and other entities who maintain data on misuse incidents reported by registrants and survey a random sample of registrants in each (GTLD) and selected (CCTLD)'s.

Now what I did, and again, please don't put more stake in what I did than necessary. I just tried to facilitate it. What I put as a possible hypotheses there is there're a significant number of misuse cases involving receipt of unwanted emails, SPAM.

If nothing else my example is to illustrate what we're looking for in terms of a hypotheses that could be tested.

(Steve Delbianco): (Chuck), this is (Steve Delbianco). I was the author of Study Submission Number 1 and I wanted to clarify that the way I submitted it a month ago already was summarized once in the document that (Liz) did, the summary. And then you made another attempt to further consolidate and summarize it for today's hypotheses look.

And by doing two generations removed from the original there are certain elements that get lost.

(Chuck): Okay.

(Steve Delbianco): I don't propose that everyone go back and read the gory details of the actual study submission but in this (unintelligible)...

(Chuck): And as you can tell I didn't.

(Steve Delbianco): Oh, yeah. But in this instance I thought it would be useful for all if I were to read the actual hypothesis that I did submit for Study Number 1. You would see that there's two elements of it that have been lost in the multiple summaries.

(Chuck): Okay.

(Steve Delbianco): They might not even be worth preserving, but just in case I wanted to point it out. The way I wrote the hypothesis for Study Number 1 was, "Public access to WHOIS data is responsible for a material number of cases of misuse that have caused harm to natural persons whose Web sites don't have a commercial purpose."

(Chuck): That's a...

(Steve Delbianco): But (unintelligible) exclusively on (stand) and I included two distinctions that weren't captured in the summary which is that the harm I was hypothesizing about was harm to natural persons, not the legal persons, and those who didn't have a commercial purpose.

And the importance to that as you probably know from the previous (unintelligible) working groups is that legal persons or natural persons with a commercial purpose wouldn't have been entitled to the same sort of privacy protection that natural persons (will know).

So I'm trying to preserve a lot of those important distinctions and the (unintelligible). SPAM was just one of the ones I brought up but I did say that it was in a material number of cases of misuse and that I was worried about the targeting of natural persons who's Web sites did not have a commercial purpose.

(Chuck): In my opinion, (Steve), that's a very well formulated hypothesis and I'm sorry I didn't go back to the original documents that I'll confess that I was actually developing some of these while on stage in one of the (GNSO) meetings to see how easy it was to do. And so I didn't have time to go back thoroughly.

But does anybody disagree with just using that one sentence hypothesis that (Steve) just read?

Man: Can you read it again, (Steve)?

(Steve Delbianco): "Public access to WHOIS data is responsible for a material number of cases of misuse that have caused harm to natural persons whose Web sites don't have a commercial purpose."

(Chuck): That seems to be very testable.

Wendy Seltzer: (Unintelligible).

(Chuck): And keep in mind we're not going to get into whether you can actually do it. It's not our responsibility to decide whether the study is actually achievable but rather is it a clear hypothesis that could be tested and if

we tested it we would get information that would be helpful. That's what the question (unintelligible) council is going to have to ask.

Wendy Seltzer: Quick question...

Man: (Chuck)?

Wendy Seltzer: ...if I may?

(Chuck): Go ahead.

Wendy Seltzer: (Steve), do you mean to limit it to people using domain names for Web sites or to make it more general whose Internet use does not have commercial purpose?

(Chuck): Good question. (Steve), you want to respond?

(Steve Delbianco): The former which is to say...

(Chuck): So you...

(Steve Delbianco): ...limiting it to those whose registration of a Web site in the (provision) of WHOIS data expose them to the harm that are somewhat alleged. Harms that include (unintelligible) SPAM, the violation of the (unintelligible).

Wendy Seltzer: So excluding those who have registered domain names but are not using them for Web sites?

(Steve Delbianco): I would - let me ask you this. If you've registered the name and then not using it for a Web site are you still - is your information on WHOIS still disclosable?

Wendy Seltzer: Absolutely.

Man: Yes, certainly.

(Chuck): Yeah, I would think that the broader definition...

(Steve Delbianco): Then they should be included. Yeah, the broader definition then.

(Chuck): Yeah, I think that (Wendy)'s suggestion is good.

(Steve Delbianco): Yeah.

Liz Gasster: So can you repeat that, please, (Wendy)?

Wendy Seltzer: It was just to substitute Internet use rather domain name use for Web site.

Liz Gasster: So keep Internet use versus domain name use.

(Chuck): Okay, so once you've got that captured, (Liz), why don't you read back what you have?

Liz Gasster: I can't because I don't - I have to go back to (Steve)'s original...

(Chuck): Oh, okay.

(Steve Delbianco): (Liz), I would say the public access to WHOIS data is responsible for a material number of cases of misuse that have caused harm to natural persons to...

Liz Gasster: Okay, it's just that I can't type that fast. So if you want me to capture it now so just go slower, (Steve). I have, "Public access to WHOIS data is responsible for a material number of..."

(Steve Delbianco): "Cases of misuse that have caused harm to natural persons..."

Liz Gasster: Yeah, "natural persons whose..."

(Steve Delbianco): "...whose Web sites don't have a commercial purposes."

Liz Gasster: "...whose Internet use"?

Wendy Seltzer: Whose domain name...

Man: (Unintelligible)...

Wendy Seltzer: ...use...

Man: Whose registration - (Wendy), would that satisfy? "Whose registration did not have a commercial purpose"?

Wendy Seltzer: Yes, yeah, excellent.

Liz Gasster: Okay, "Whose registration does not have a commercial purpose." Got it.

(Chuck): Okay?

Liz Gasster: So I guess - okay, go ahead.

(Chuck): Now, is there any objection to - or further edits to that hypothesis?
Okay, very good. And by the way we'll do - obviously there are a lot of people that expressed interest in this group that aren't on this call and these will be available for comment by those people between now and our next meeting.

I don't want to go back and revisit all of the ones we've covered so there'll be one shot - well, I shouldn't be quite so restrictive. Ideally we'd like to get these resolved and move on and not have to retrace our steps. So - but we will give option for those not on the call to comment on that.

Lee Eulgen: (Chuck), this is Lee Eulgen. If I could just make one comment.

(Chuck): Sure, (Lee).

Lee Eulgen: And it's not specific to Study Suggestion Number 1 but (Steve)'s point about the, you know, hypothesis that you've put in your sort of stepping off point for discussion versus what was originally in his study suggests to me that - and obviously we can all, you know, hopefully find this by way of the ICANN Web site but before the next call it might be worthwhile to have circulated all of the original hypotheses as actually submitted, you know, by the submitter originally several months ago.

Because I think it would be worthwhile as we're going through these to compare sort of, you know, the evolution of the hypothesis - of each

hypothesis relative to what was originally submitted because I think it's from what was originally submitted that we can best glean what the intent of the study is.

(Chuck): And I think you're absolutely correct, (Lee). But let me put that reasonability on each of us to do that rather than taking a lot of time to go through the more detailed document on these calls. Because if we do that it's going to be extremely - it's going to multiply the time we will take to do this many times over.

Now, let me also point out that in some cases hypotheses, in my opinion, were quite clear, in other cases it's almost impossible to even derive a hypothesis. So that will be more helpful in some cases than others.

Liz Gasster: So this is (Liz), two things on that. The first is that I think it'd be helpful if Glen sends the link to all the original comments that were submitted because at this point it's a little bit buried in the archives public forum and you'll spend some time looking for it. It would, you know, better serve just getting to it and Glen and I will point you to that.

And then the second thing to be aware of is particularly (Chuck) referenced it was difficult to derive hypotheses from certain of the submissions in that largely - the (gack), of course, didn't submit any hypotheses along with their recommendations.

So I think everyone else did whether they're entirely on point or some of them are verbose. And so I think it's useful but just keep in mind that on the (gack) ones we're going to have to surmise together what the hypotheses, you know, how best to articulate those hypotheses.

(Chuck): And in some cases what I've found is that it wasn't so much a hypothesis that was being tested as much as it was a suggestion for gathering some data. And which is, I think, a little different thing than a hypothesis to be tested. But we'll get to some of those.

Okay...

Steve Metalitz: (Chuck), this is Steve Metalitz. Could I make a comment here? I think in light of what (Lee) said and what we've just been through with Number 1, it would be useful to - I recognize that what (Liz) said, some of these hypotheses that were proposed by the people who proposed the studies may not be useful.

But some of them may well be, and rather than have to go back and readjust based on that perhaps we should jump ahead to the proposals that don't have hypotheses with them such as the (gack) studies and do those first, the (gack) suggestions.

And then return to the others when we actually have what the author or what the proposer thought was the hypothesis in front of us. Just a suggestion that we would do the (gack) ones first because we know they don't have proposed hypotheses with them.

Liz Gasster: And I just want to note - it's (Liz) - one other complexity here which is that the way that we amass this study input unfortunately doesn't have the names of the submitters on them. And in order to cross reference you have to use that other document that we developed that's cross referenced, the recommendations, the 25 that were submitted with the actual names of the submitters which we can send out again.

I'm really sorry about this. It makes it like a three step process because the...

Steve Metalitz: I'm not concerned with the names of the submitters but just that as I recall...

Liz Gasster: Well, you might be though because, like, some of those are going to be - the care, for example, that (Steve) took in developing his hypotheses and certain others that, you know, you're going to be particularly interested I think in capturing and verifying. And then there are others that, you know, you can clearly dismiss on the face (unintelligible).

Steve Metalitz: How easy is it when Glen sends out the link to this other information to link the study number with the submission?

Liz Gasster: You know, I though I captured the original hypotheses somewhere and I could cut and paste them, you know, into one document (unintelligible) go through this. I think it's kind of laborious at this point for everyone to (unintelligible).

(Chuck): Yeah, and that's what I was trying to avoid.

Liz Gasster: I know. I know. But I think, you know, I have a good sense of what's going to be required here and imagining the 30 of you going off to do that just...

(Chuck): Yeah, right, right.

Liz Gasster: So let me do that and I'll try to get it done today and send it out.

(Chuck): (Steve), I think what I'm going to do is go ahead and proceed in the order that's in front of us and then we'll deal with them as we come to them because it doesn't sound like it's too easy to - and in some cases some - even some of the (gack) studies were things where there was a hypothesis.

But I also will flag, at least in my own opinion, where I thought - and I put a question mark in a couple places what the hypothesis was. So we can then go back to those - the sources there.

So let's - any other comments on Study Number 1? And I'm going in the order that they are on the table that was sent around and that was the same order as they were grouped in that one reference document.

So the next study is Study Number 14 and to use the abbreviated description of that, that (Liz) created was to create a set of new email addresses use half of them to register domain names and monitor all for SPAM for 90 days to determine how much WHOIS information contributes to SPAM.

And what I put there was simply, "Modification to WHOIS would be useful in deterring SPAM and other such illegal or undesirable activity." How would you phrase that one? And again, if somebody wants to - I'm not going to try since I'm leading the meeting to go back and look at all the detail but somebody else is welcome to do that.

Lee Eulgen: This is Lee Eulgen and I'm just looking back at the original hypothesis submitted in (unintelligible).

(Chuck): Can you read that for us, (Lee)?

Lee Eulgen: Sure. I just found it online here. "The WHOIS database is used only to a minor extent to generate SPAM and other such illegal or undesirable activities."

I mean, I put it out to the group but I actually like that hypothesis better, with all respect to you, of course, (Chuck) in your efforts to put together these summaries.

(Chuck): I'm not sensitive to that, so don't worry about that part.

Lee Eulgen: Okay.

(Chuck): So read that again, please?

Lee Eulgen: Sure, "The WHOIS database is used only to a minor extent to generate SPAM and other such illegal or undesirable activities."

Man: Isn't that the mirror image of the hypothesis we stated in Number 1 and thereby can they not be combined?

(Chuck): What do you think? A discussion?

Man: I think the real question is the extent, whether it's major or minor that's what a study should tell us, that's the reason for a study.

(Chuck): And Number 1 says, "There are significant number of misuse cases."
So...

Man: I use the word materially in an accounting sense.

(Chuck): Right.

(Steve Delbianco): This is (Steve). Even if - I'm having a little trouble understanding this. Even if the hypotheses can be put together or are mirror images of each other, as I understand it just from the summary there are two totally different things being suggested here.

One says you create new email address and you see if SPAM results and the other is you go to people that would already have historically collected this information and ask them have there been problems.

Now those are two totally different ways of proceeding so I'm not sure - when we say we're going to combine - or we might combine the hypotheses how does that correlate with the fact that the methodology proposed is different in the two cases?

(Chuck): Good point and I wonder if - what if we were to use the hypotheses that (Lee) just read to us that was in the original submission and maybe just put a parenthetical, "This may be related to Study 1." That doesn't mean that it shouldn't be a separate study but just to - so that for the council benefit when they see this list they would also see that we noted the similarity.

Woman: One of the things that we talked about was sort of the next step which would be that, you know, staff would have to go off and determine once any were selected and figure out the cost and feasibility.

And so one possibility, I mean, one rationale for grouping these together would be to then turn to staff, you know, probably an expert (unintelligible) staff would identify so it would then help define, well, which approach would gather the most accurate information or what are the benefits.

And, you know, we would go back to the original proposals and say, "Okay, of these three in this one category, if this category were selected then what's the methodology that would yield the best - most accurate, most useful, most cost-effective, the feasibility questions?" and look at the studies within each category that way.

(Tony Harris): Can I make a comment, (Chuck)?

(Chuck): Sure, (Tony).

(Tony Harris): Yeah, just thinking on this I don't think your idea is all that bad actually because if these new email addresses are created specifically related to WHOIS and they're not used in any other manner, in other words they don't become an email user, they're not given out in different activities which normally a person would - his email would turn up when he buys something, when he makes a reservation, and we don't know how many people resell this information, how many companies resold.

So actually you would have - if you had SPAM originated from these email addresses whose only function is to be included in the WHOIS you really know that that SPAM, you know, it's coming from there, it's not coming from some list that, you know, Visa resold to somebody. Okay?

Liz Gasster: And this is (Liz). Wasn't that exactly what the (unintelligible) study did?

(Steve Delbianco): Yes, it is and - this is (Steve Delbianco), I want to remind everybody that our charter is to look at hypotheses and not necessarily specify the kind of a study that would be used to falsify the hypothesis.

We all did that in our submissions but in this particular case are we really supposed to go beyond the hypothesis and suggest the type of study that's (unintelligible)?

(Chuck): No, and I think the reason we went down that path is Steve Metalitz's point is that we have to be careful about combining the hypotheses because of the fact that the methodology may be different and so forth.

So - but you're right (Steve Delbianco), that the - that's not our task.

(Steve Delbianco): And (unintelligible) to (unintelligible) point, the (unintelligible) study did show that when registrars used (capture) technologies to prevent harvesting of email addresses it significantly reduced, if not eliminated, SPAM that arrived at those email addresses.

(Chuck): Now -

Tim Ruiz: (Chuck)?

(Chuck): Go ahead, (Tim). I think that's (Tim) I hear.

Tim Ruiz: I think, yeah, I think that the good point was made that, you know, getting into a debate over whether there's (unintelligible) studies have

done this or not or what the results were is all kind of outside of the scope of what we're supposed to be doing.

And then the other issue I would have with trying to combine would be - especially in this case the Study 14 seems to be dealing primarily with SPAM but I think, if I understand (Steve) correctly, the Study 1 could be misuses other than SPAM. You know, that it isn't just SPAM that could potentially cause harm to natural persons.

To (Melissa's) point, the (Estach) study did show that when registrars use capture technology to prevent even harvesting of email addresses it significantly reduced if not eliminated spam that arrived at those email addresses.

((Crosstalk))

Tim Ruiz: This is (Tim).

(Chuck): Go ahead (Tim). I think that's (Tim) out there.

Tim Ruiz: Yeah, I think a good point was made that, you know, getting into debate over whether there's previous studies that have done this or not or what the results were is all outside of the scope of what we're supposed to be doing.

And then the other issue I would have would kind of combine the - especially in this case. The Study 14 seems to be dealing primarily with spam but I think if I understand (Steve) correctly, the study (unintelligible) could be misuses other than spam.

You know, it isn't just spam that could potentially cause harm to the natural person. So I fell like there are different studies and each has a different hypothesis. And I would prefer we just look at them individually and assign hypothesis and try not to do too much combining.

(Chuck): Now I think it is okay if we add some parenthetical notes that might be useful to the Council without getting into any elaborate process of how they're going to be done and whatever. So anything that can be useful to Council as I said at least hypotheses might be useful. But our main - our primary tasks - our really only task is to convert each of these studies into a hypothesis or two that needs to be tested.

Now back to the question I asked before then. Is there any discomfort with (Lee's) suggested to use the wording from the original study proposal. I also then added a parenthetical that this might be related to Study 1 and maybe we need to qualify that and say but may not be another - but may need to be a separate study or we can just leave the parenthetical out. What are your thoughts?

(Lee): (Chuck), this is (Lee) again and just regarding the parenthetical and this is, you know, from the original working group, we did talk quite a bit about the ability of a lot of the studies to potentially be combined or the relation between, you know, certain of the studies to (other of the studies).

And I think what came of that was not sort of going to a parenthetical, you know, type, you know, just citing the specific relationships but rather I think it was (Liz) who put together the, you know, who grouped these studies into the seven or eight areas.

So I think if we end up starting to go down the road of putting parentheticals on each one, we'll end up putting an awful lot of parentheticals whereas I think they're already somewhat grouped by, you know, in accordance with their subject area.

(Chuck): That makes sense to me. So is there anybody who's opposed to using the wording that (Lee) read for us from the original submission? (Lee) you want to read that again please.

(Lee): Sure. The Who Is database is used only to a minor extent to generate spam and other such illegal or undesirable activities.

(Chuck): Any discomfort or suggested edits to that hypothesis, to Number 14?

(Allen Greenberg): (Allen), I have a slight discomfort with use minor. You know, the use of Who Is in general is so vast that how do we recognize minor use?

(Chuck): (Comment)?

(Allen Greenberg): Well presumably if you did what this study suggests and you monitored for spam for 90 days and there was none or almost none - I'm not defining what almost none is, that I grant would be minor. That would prove the hypothesis and if there was a lot of spam, then that would disprove the hypothesis. I mean, without getting into how you would draw those lines, but I think that's how it would work.

(Chuck): I think the study designer too if it was decided to pursue this particular study further is going to have to come up with some definition of minor.

So you're points well taken (Allen) that obviously there's a term there that's going to need definition.

I think the hypothesis is clear enough even though there's that ambiguity there that a decision could be made whether, assuming minor could be appropriately defined, that the information would be gained from the study would be useful enough.

Man: I think the intent is clear. The wording I don't like but I'm willing to live with it with the assumption that whoever's going to do the next step will look for intent not working.

(Chuck): Right. And I think that's a fair assumption. Any other comments on Number 14? Okay. So lets go to 15. And if somebody wants to look at one up in the original that's good too. You're probably way ahead of me on that.

But in (Liz's) study submission Number 15 it said create a set of new email addresses. Use them to register new domain names that registrars that allow and disallow Port 43 Who Is queries and monitor all for spam to determine the extent to which Port 43 Who Is queries contribute to spam.

Now does - I can avoid even reading mine that I put there. But if somebody's got the original hypothesis wording. Anybody...

(Liz): Yeah, I've got it.

(Chuck): Okay, (Liz).

- Liz Gasster: Those using Who Is data - it's actually very similar to what's there. Those using Who Is data to facilitate illegal or undesirable activities such as spam depend on Port 43 access to Who Is to obtain Who Is data.
- (Chuck): Okay. And I had said most use of Who Is (and so) illegal undesirable activities is traceable to data mining over Port 43. I'm okay with the wording that (Liz) just read. What's the preferences of the group?
- (Lee): This is (Lee). I like the original.
- (Chuck): Okay. Anybody opposed to the original?
- Tim Ruiz: This is (Tim). I can live with either one actually.
- (Chuck): Yeah, I think they say pretty much - is they're very similar in terms of the main thrust. But as long as the original is clear, I think that's good. So one more time on that one (Lee).
- (Lee): Those using Who Is data to facilitate illegal or undesirable activities such as spam depend on Port 43 access to Who Is to obtain Who Is data.
- (Chuck): Any objections to that or additional changes? Okay. Going to 21 and I kind of lump 21 and GAC 2 together so whether I was right or not on that. And I came up with an awfully broad hypothesis there too. But 21 was survey registrars and human rights organizations to determine how Who Is is being used in ways that seem to have no bearing on the security and stability of the DNS.

And the GAC Bullet Number 2 was the types and extensive misuses of Who Is data and the harm caused by each type of misuse including economic use of Who Is data and spam generation, abuse of personal data, loss of reputation or identity theft, security cost and loss of data.

So is the study submission Number 21 helpful in terms of a clear and concise hypothesis?

Liz Gasster: It's not concise. But it's clear. If not, I'll leave up to you guys that the public Who Is databases are ready and often used sources of personal data for those seeking to harass, abuse or stalk individuals and organizations. That the public Who Is databases are being used in mined regularly by direct mail and related companies for their commercial benefit to compile personal data which they then use to combine, sell and distribute (unintelligible) massive lists in databases.

(Chuck): Is there more than one hypothesis there?

(Liz): I mean it sounds to me that like you could combine the - you know, if you agree that it's all bad behavior, the use and mining of the information by direct mail and related companies for commercial benefit as some may not think so, then you could combine that with the harass, abuse and stalks if there's, you know, malfeasance of these various kinds and that Who Is is a source of that. But that may not be a consensus of the group.

(Chuck): Now, was my - and now I see something I would do differently in the very brief hypothesis I wrote. I said there are abuses of public display of Who Is. I think I would say there are significant abuses of public

display of Who Is. And you're right (Allen), we should probably - we'd have to define significant. But is that too simplified?

Man: As it's summarized, Submission 21 isn't referencing public display of Who Is. Is that in the - I didn't catch whether that's in the hypothesis that the proposer...

(Liz): It is. That's the public Who Is databases.

Man: Okay. All right.

Liz Gasster: I mean one thing you could say about abuses, you could spell out the different kinds of abuses or you could get parenthetically describe the kinds of abuses, but you suggested material abuses.

(Chuck): Yeah. I said - my edit to my own?

Liz Gasster: Yeah.

(Chuck): I think I said significant but it's not - either one's fine. I think probably it's more significant. In other words, there's a lot of abuses - enough abuses coming from it that it's a problem. I mean if it finds out to be very minor that, you know, lets say there's 1% - only a level of 1% of abuses, then it's not near the same problem if we find 20%. You know, something like that.

What's the leaning of the group in terms of this? I'd rather not have two lengthy hypotheses if we can avoid it for simplicity sake. But maybe we can't avoid it in some cases. What's the thinking of the group?

Liz Gasster: (Chuck) you could replace of with caused by. There's a causal thing here that's not...

(Chuck): Yeah. That would be - that's fine. Is the abbreviated form - there are significant abuses...

Liz Gasster: Caused by public display.

(Chuck): ...caused by public display of Who Is - sufficient for this?

Man: I just wonder whether that's going to be meaningful to the Council if they want to understand what this proposal's about.

Liz Gasster: You think it would help to call out some of the specific, you know, for harassment abuse and also commercial marketing - I mean, does that help in any way to make it more apparent on its space?

Man: I mean I think it gives a clear picture of what that proposer was driving at anyway.

(Steve Delbianco): And if you need - this is (Steve). If you read some of the proposals that were submitted, the proposers, at least I did on Number 1. I anticipated that we would need to consult other sources like Consumer Protection Agency via people who have been complaining about the harassment to policy and consumer protection groups. I didn't think we would get much data there.

And there was some further refinement of understanding that if we test hypothesis like is there abuse and is there spam, we're testing in a vacuum here because in many respects the (charter) that you capture

and other data masking techniques can actually cut down on the incidents of it.

So we're testing something that's already has certain other remedies not to mention the fact that to the extent to which people avail themselves of proxy registrations for privacy protection, then we're one level removed from getting spam as well.

Some of the things we're testing only answer these threshold questions that were discussed two years ago, which were things like is Who Is responsible for a lot of spam and abuse. And answering that question two years later really confuses things because things like capture and proxy have already mitigated to some extent what's going on here today in the marketplace.

(Chuck): Excuse me, I'm going to interrupt just a second. Somebody is handling some dishes or something and if you could mute your phone, it would be useful.

Liz Gasster: I wonder if it's me typing.

(Chuck): No it doesn't sound like that.

Man: It's someone stacking and washing...

Man: It sounds like a dishwasher.

Liz Gasster: I wish it was here.

(Chuck): No you're type - that doesn't sound like typing. But anyway, thank you for doing that. Now (Steve), do you have a suggestion how you would do this one?

(Steve Delbianco): (Chuck) when we do the hypothesis, we may need to clarify for Council whether the hypothesis you seek to test is a hypothesis of unprotected Who Is or Who Is by registrars that do use capture to protect it. That could end up being a very important distinction. We have some of the hypothesis anticipate that there are measures that the market has already evolved that mitigate the abuses we were concerned about two years ago.

(Chuck): Isn't this study though assuming that there's public display of Who Is in contrast to a proxy service where the information's not there.

(Steve Delbianco): (Chuck), I don't think it assumes that necessarily. Because when we put together the test group, the test group will include registrars that you use capture and capture stops machines from harvesting the email addresses. And secondarily there are (response) used proxy registration and both will get mixed in with the study group. They'll get mixed in with the test group and we won't really have a better sense of what the data shows.

((Crosstalk))

Liz Gasster: So just - sorry, this is Liz Gasster. I think I have a suggestion to (Steve Metallica's) concern but (Steve Delbianco) how would you - like to me it seems like the issue you're highlighting would get picked up in other studies that have been proposed. Do you think there's something in

this study that needs to capture so to speak some aspect that's not there now?

(Steve Delbianco): Right. And the point is do the hypothesis anticipate a plain visible to the public harvestable Who Is with or without proxy? And I don't know that it can do it right now, but we probably ought to read (spam) in the hypothesis and see whether they should be clarified to say for instance unprotected. That it does not use proxy causing material amount of abuse in non-commercial registrar.

Liz Gasster: But wouldn't that be in a sense captured - the concept at least by public display of Who Is?

(Steve Delbianco): But public display, capture is public display.

Liz Gasster: That's true.

(Steve Delbianco): A member of the public (a member of) registrar who uses capture and if I as a person type in those capture characters, I get public display of Who Is. It is public. It's just not machine-readable.

((Crosstalk))

(Steve Delbianco): ...being harvested.

(Wendy): Its time I jump in. It's Wendy.

(Chuck): Go ahead (Wendy).

(Wendy): Maybe just to suggest that we break the hypothesis out into do various measures change the susceptibility of abuse and the various measures could be all of the different things that have been discussed that capture the closing of Port 43, the use or non-use of different types of proxy registrations and the test set would be comparing registrations across those various kinds of protections.

((Crosstalk))

(Chuck): ...that approach. Comments?

Man: Is that what was proposed in this study in 21?

Liz Gasster: No. This goes - 21 was really more limited which is to measure the extent to which public access is being used for either the harassment and stalking type of abuse or the marketing massive database type of abuse. That's what the original study focused on.

(Wendy): Are we tied to that original study?

Liz Gasster: I think that there might be other - I think we should hang onto this idea and look to see if it's captured in other studies. So right now I have the two questions in both but we could do a placeholder and see if it...

(Chuck): Now how did you capture (Steve's)...

Liz Gasster: Yeah. What I did was - (Steve's) is just a parenthetical for now which we can always modify. But what I wrote was there are significant abuses parenthesis including harassment, stalking, et cetera as well as

to compile massive lists for marketing purposes, close parens, closed
by, sorry, caused by public display of Who Is.

((Crosstalk))

Liz Gasster: We could say that more artfully but at least we capture the concept that
abuse - basically defining what significant abuses are.

(Chuck): Comments on that?

Tim Ruiz: Yeah. This is (Tim).

(Chuck): Go ahead (Tim).

Tim Ruiz: Yeah, I think I'm not real comfortable with making, you know - I think
what (Liz) read is okay but I know I wouldn't be comfortable with
making too many other modifications to the intended hypothesis for
the...

((Crosstalk))

Liz Gasster: So what I did though (Tim) is actually just extract from the original...

((Crosstalk))

(Chuck): Hold it. Hold it. Let (Tim) finish.

Liz Gasster: Sorry.

Tim Ruiz: Thank you. But what I would be - and I just said I'm not - I don't have a problem with what (Liz) just suggested or read. But I'm concerned about - I agree with (Steve's) concerns but I think the way to handle those is that maybe instead of having a lot of individual parentheticals on the studies that I think what (Steve's) concern is about, you know, the, you know, capture and privacy and how those might have - that that would be maybe a comment that we could make in regards to this entire area. Because that's something that would probably apply to all these studies.

(Steve Delbianco): I agree (Tim). I agree with you.

(Chuck): So I'm not sure I'm clear then on what the suggestion is.

Tim Ruiz: That we don't - that we don't try to get too handy with the hypotheses that if one exists and that instead a concern like what (Steve) raised that we make a general comment about the studies in Area 1 that says that some, you know, something that may need to be considered in regards to the studies in Area 1 would be the use of capture and privacy or proxy services and how that might affect the hypotheses or the outcome whatever. But make it as a general statement...

((Crosstalk))

(Chuck): Right. Okay I got it. Is anybody opposed to that approach? Then let me suggest (Steve Delbianco) would you - would you email to (Liz) a little general statement to that effect. And if you want to work with (Tim) to finalize it, that's fine. I'll let you guys decide that. And then that could be a comment for Area 1 or wherever we want to put it when we get that.

(Steve Delbianco): Sure.

(Chuck): Is that okay?

(Steve Delbianco): Yeah.

(Chuck): Then are we okay then with the language that (Liz) had there for now? And by the way (Liz) what I would do I think instead of having that parenthetical that really breaks up the hypothesis is I would add a follow on sentence or maybe use a semicolon and just provide for example or something like that rather than interrupting the hypothesis. Just a format issue.

(Liz): Got it.

(Chuck): Is that okay? That make sense?

(Allen Greenberg): To what - it's (Allen). To what extent are we really trying to make these hypotheses worded as a hypothesis instead of a statement around the area?

(Chuck): I would like to see them be a hypothesis. Do you have a suggestion in that regard?

(Allen Greenberg): Not with regard to this one, but I was just thinking of the caveat that we just said we'll do in a general one. You know, if we are adding it to this one as a hypothesis, we would say capture privacy proxy services, mitigate the misuse of Who Is information and that is then proven or

disproven. But a lot of these we're starting out with ifs and it's not really a hypothesis.

(Chuck): Yeah, you know, I agree on that...

((Crosstalk))

(Allen): ...worried about that.

(Chuck): But I'm not sure that (Steve) and (Tim) were talking about actually putting a hypothesis...

((Crosstalk))

(Allen Greenberg): No, I was just using that as an example.

(Chuck): Yeah. Okay. All right. Okay. But I agree with you (Allen) that we should word them as hypothesis so it's a statement.

(Allen Greenberg): That may limit their usefulness in some cases where it's not going to be a black white answer.

(Chuck): Well I'm sure in a lot of cases it won't be a black and white answer but that's what happens when you do a study.

(Steve Delbianco): (Chuck) this is (Steve). Could I get in the queue?

(Chuck): Sure. Go ahead (Steve).

(Steve Delbianco): Yeah, I just think - I mean this discussion we're having now I think we've brought a lot of good ideas about what might be useful studies, but I think the charter we've been given - I find this frustrating too but I think the charter that we've been given, we're not supposed to consider whether these would be useful studies or whether there are ways to modify them to be more useful.

((Crosstalk))

(Chuck): That's correct.

(Steve Delbianco): ...try to extract the hypothesis. I think we had a study group where that was more relevant but in this group I don't think we're asked to do that.

(Chuck): Agree.

Liz Gasster: I just want to point out though on this specific issue that (Steve) raised, if you look at Area 5A it does basically pose that question. So I think it's captured in that concept. More restrictive Who Is display requirements would lead to more (unintelligible).

(Chuck): Is that a separate...

((Crosstalk))

(Chuck): ...hypothesis?

Man: I missed that.

Woman: Yeah, I just meant to say that the issue that I think (Steve) was particularly highlighting which is the various measures like capture change the susceptibility of Who Is to abuse.

Man: And what I was saying is I missed the comment just after you.

Woman: Oh.

Man: Someone said something.

(Chuck): (Liz), is what you just - what you said previously, is that a separate hypothesis in this...

Liz Gasster: Yeah. It's down on Area 5A it's study note Recommendation 6 in GAC Number 1.

(Chuck): Oh, okay. So...

Liz Gasster: Impact of Who Is on crime and abuse.

(Chuck): So we don't need to cover it here or we do?

Liz Gasster: I think that it's something that - I mean if (Steve) and (Tim) who are raising the concern agree, I think we could basically move the rephrase question down to that point and when we get there see if it's, you know, fully encompassed by...

(Chuck): (Steve) and (Tim) is that make sense to you? Does that make sense to you?

(Steve Delbianco): This is (Steve). I thought (Tim) started to capture it more accurately to say this. That any of the - any of the tests that are done for hypothesis in Area 1 should be clear as to whether they're testing registrations that are done without proxies and registrations that are done with registrars to employ capture protection (methods).

What we're really not saying is that we have a hypothesis that matters. What we're saying is that any test done to judge those hypotheses have to be explicit about including data in their sample that includes both capture and non-capture, proxy, non-proxy.

That way the dataset that comes back can answer multiple questions later on.

(Chuck): You're simply saying the study must be cognizant of the fact that there are methodologies that are being used and should not ignore them in doing the test - in doing the study.

(Steve Delbianco): Yes.

(Chuck): Either factor them in or exclude them but not ignore that they may or may not have been used.

(Steve Delbianco): And given a chance I would say definitely factor them in and the samples should include groups of registrations that are done with proxies, groups that are not, groups that are done with capture base registrars and groups that are not. The datasets when those four answers come back, you have a much better idea of how to formulate policy going ahead.

(Chuck): Okay. Let me - again, send an email to (Liz) with that comment. And for right now, we'll put a - we'll leave it associated with Area 1. We can decide - because that's a little bit out of our scope, it still may be useful to provide to the Council. We can decide of where to fit it in when we get through the whole exercise. So - is everybody still there?

Man: Some of us are. Plus the annoying noise.

(Chuck): Okay. All right.

Man: Can I suggest as we go along instead of debating for each one the exact changes that if we have thoughts that come up that maybe relevant in further analysis, put them in square brackets or something...

(Chuck): Okay.

Man: ...a comment this committee, this working group has come up with which may or may not be relevant. But lets not debate it each time.

(Chuck): Yeah. I think it will vary depending on the issue. But I don't have any problem with that to the extent - as much as we can narrow it down, I'd like us to get some closure.

Man: Certainly.

(Chuck): If it becomes too time consuming, I think your suggestion is good. Now last on Area 1, which is probably where we'll have to wrap it up today, is GAC Bullet 2. Is that really encompassed in Number 21? What do people think?

Should we send - (Suzanne Sen) an email and say hey, you know, we concluded that this GAC recommendation really fits with this hypothesis? Do you agree with that or would you change it differently? Thinking on that?

(Steve Delbianco): Well, this is (Steve). Maybe one way to address it would be to include in the parenthetical or after the semicolon, whatever (Liz) uses, the examples that are given in GAC Bullet Number 2.

(Chuck): Not a bad idea. Any opposition to that?

Liz Gasster: Sorry, what would I do?

(Steve Delbianco): When you're listing the harms or the, you know, examples of the misuse, you could list the things that are listed in GAC Bullet Number 2.

Liz Gasster: I see.

(Chuck): Make sense?

Liz Gasster: Yeah. So I would move it up to 21.

((Crosstalk))

(Steve Delbianco): Just so we combine...

Liz Gasster: So we wouldn't have a separate entry for GAC 2 at this point.

(Chuck): Right. We may want to leave the way the table is right now so that it's clear that we haven't ignored it. But it is a reference back to 21.

Liz Gasster: Great. I will do that.

(Chuck): Okay. Now a suggestion for moving forward. Would it be useful if we divided up some of these hypotheses and assigned different small groups of individuals? It could be just - it could be one, it could be a couple people to take a stab at going back to the original and putting forward a hypothesis before our next meeting?

Man: I thought that (Liz) had volunteered to give us a three-column table or something like that also showing the original hypothesis.

(Chuck): Is that correct (Liz)?

Liz Gasster: Yeah. Yeah. I'll do that.

(Chuck): Okay.

Liz Gasster: But it's going to take some time. If we don't need to do that, I won't. But, you know, I'm happy to do it just to make it easier so that everyone doesn't have to do it.

((Crosstalk))

Liz Gasster: And I just...

(Chuck): I think that's a good suggestion but if we could - if we could get some volunteers to work on at least Areas 2 and 3 for our next meeting and

not waiting for (Liz) to get that thing out, I think that would facilitate our time next week. Are there some volunteers?

(James Bladell): This is (James). I'll go ahead and volunteer.

(Chuck): And do you want to take one of those areas or both? (James) what do you - what do you...

(James Bladell): Depending on if I'm solo, I can take Area 2.

(Chuck): Okay. Anybody want to do Area 2 with (James)? Okay (James), you've got Area 2. Can I - how about a volunteer for Area 3? And again, you can totally ignore what I did there. If it's useful, good. If it's not, don't worry about it.

(CW): (Chuck). It's (CW). I'll got - I'll volunteer for 3.

(Chuck): Okay. Excellent. While we're at - let me maybe just being probably over optimistic. Anybody want to take Area 4? I won't push for that one but if there's a volunteer, I'll take it. Okay.

Tim Ruiz: This is (Tim). I'll do Area 4.

(Chuck): Okay. Good. And then if you can distribute those on the list and you're welcome to use the wiki too to post things if that works for you. But certainly on the list so that you can - and if you want to use the - just take to use the table format the portion of the table that you want and then insert them or however it's convenient for you just so it's clear for the team. That would be great.

Our next meeting then will be a week from today, same time. We'll shoot for an hour and a half. And we'll pickup where we left off. I'll allow a little bit of time for any comments from people who weren't on the call or any discussion that occurred on the list on Area 1 although I don't want to, you know, retrace our steps there. To the extent that we need to, we'll spend a little bit of time on that and we'll jump right into Area 2.

Any questions or comments? Okay. Thanks everybody. And (Liz) a question for you. Then in terms of the - you'll paste what we've done into the wiki.

(Liz): Yeah, I'll past what we've done into the wiki right now.

((Crosstalk))

(Chuck): And you'll distribute the red line Word version as well?

Liz Gasster: Yes. And I'll do that - I can do that now or I can do that a little later when I do the other document.

(Chuck): As soon as possible.

Liz Gasster: Okay.

(Chuck): And I'll maybe hold off to do my little meeting summary until I see at least the Word redline.

Liz Gasster: Okay. Great.

(Chuck): Thank you everybody. Talk to you next week.

Woman: Thank you.

Man: Thanks (Chuck).

Woman: Bye.

(Chuck): Bye.

END